arXiv:1007.5244v1 [math.AG] 29 Jul 2010

1

NASH PROBLEM FOR A TORIC PAIR AND THE MINIMAL LOG-DISCREPANCY

SHIHOKO ISHII

Abstract. This paper formulates the Nash problem for a pair consisting of a toric variety and an invariant ideal and gives an affirmative answer to the problem. We also prove that the minimal log-discrepacy is computed by a divisor corresponding to a Nash component, if the minimal log-discrepancy is finite. On the other hand there exists a Nash component such that the corresponding divisor has negative log-discrepancy, if the minimal log-discrepancy is $-\infty$.

1. Introduction

The Nash problem was posed by John F. Nash in his preprint (1968) which is published later as [9]. The problem is asking the bijectivity between the set of Nash components and the set of essential divisors of a singular variety X. The problem is answered positively for toric varieties and negatively in general [3]. As the counter examples are of dimension greater than 3, the Nash problem is still open for surfaces and 3-folds. The Nash problem for a surface is now steadily improving thanks to the work of M. Lejeune-Jalabert, A. Reguera ([7], [8]). A Nash component is an irreducible component of the family of arcs passing through the singular locus. So it does not depend on the existence of a resolution of the singularities of X, while an essential divisor is defined by using resolutions of the singularities of X. The study of some examples gives us a feeling that we can get the information of the singularities of X from the information of the Nash components (notion without resolutions) even for the properties defined by using resolutions.

In this paper, we consider the Nash problem for a pair consisting of a variety and an ideal on the variety. Our principles are:

(1) For an object in the toric category, the Nash problem should hold.

---

[1] This research is partly supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid (B), No 22340004 and (S),No19104001.

(2) We should be able to see whether the singularities of the pair is log-canonical/log-terminal from information given by the Nash components.

(The first principle seems reasonable since we have some evidences [2], [3], [4], [5]. The second principle is based on the observation for the counter example of the Nash problem [3].) We will show the principles are true for a toric pair consisting of a toric variety and an invariant ideal. When we consider a pair, the primary problem is how to formulate the Nash problem for the pair. Peter Petrov formulated the Nash problem for a toric pair and gave an affirmative answer in [10]. But his Nash components do not satisfy (ii). Our formulation of the Nash problem for a toric pair is different from his, but we use his result for our problem. Our Nash components are constructed on a modified space of X and this idea suggests a direction for the Nash problem in the general case.

2. The Nash problem and minimal log-discrepancy

Definition 2.1. *Let X be a scheme over an algebraically closed field k. An arc of X is a k-morphism $\alpha : \operatorname{Spec} K[[t]] \longrightarrow X$, where $K \supset k$ is a field extension. The space of arcs of X is denoted by X_∞ and the canonical projection $X_\infty \longrightarrow X$ is denoted by π^X. For a morphism $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ of k-schemes, the induced morphism between the arc spaces is denoted by $f_\infty : Y_\infty \longrightarrow X_\infty$. One can find basic materials on the space of arcs in* [6].

From now on we consider a pair (X, Z) consisting of a variety X over k and a closed subscheme $Z \subset X$, or equivalently $(X, \mathfrak{a})$, where $\mathfrak{a}$ is the defining ideal of Z. We always assume that $\operatorname{Sing} X \subset |Z|$.

Definition 2.2. *A proper birational morphism $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ with Y smooth, such that $f_{Y \setminus f^{-1}(Z)}$ is an isomorphism on $X \setminus Z$ and $f^{-1}(Z)$ is of pure codimension 1 is called a Z-resolution. When f satisfies the further conditions: $\mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_Y$ is invertible and $|f^{-1}(Z)|$ is of normal crossings, then it is called a log-resolution of (X, Z). A divisor over X is called Z-essential if it appears in every Z-resolution and is called log-essential if it appears in every log-resolution.*

Definition 2.3. *For a pair (X, Z), let $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ be a Z-resolution and $E_i (i = 1, \dots, r)$ be the irreducible exceptional divisors of f. We say that E_i is a Z-Nash divisor if the closure of $f_\infty\Big((\pi^Y)^{-1}(E_i)\Big)$ is an irreducible component of $(\pi^X)^{-1}(\operatorname{Sing} X)$ and call this component* *a Z-Nash component. Note that among all divisors over X there is a unique Z-Nash divisor up to birational equivalence for a fixed Z-Nash component.*

Theorem 2.4 (Petrov [10]). *Let X be an affine toric variety and Z an invariant closed subscheme. Then the set of Z-Nash divisors and the set of Z-essential divisors coincide.*

Definition 2.5. *Let (X,Z) be a pair with X a normal $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein variety. For a divisor E over X, the log-discrepancy of (X,Z) with respect to E is*

$$a(E;X,Z) := \operatorname{ord}_E(K_{Y/X}) - \operatorname{ord}_E(Z) + 1,$$

where let E appears on a normal variety Y birational to X. The minimal log-discrepacy of (X,Z) is defined by

$$\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) = \inf\{a(E;X,Z) \mid E \text{ divisor over } X\}.$$

Note that if $\dim X \geq 2$ *and* $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) < 0$*, then* $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) = -\infty$*. A pair (X,Z) is log-canonical (resp. log-terminal) if and only if* $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) \geq 0$ *(resp.* $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) > 0$*). For a log-canonical pair (X,Z), if* $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) = a(E;X,Z)$*, then we say that E computes the minimal log-discrepancy.*

The following shows that Z-Nash divisor does not necessarily compute the minimal log-discrepancy for (X,Z). The notation and terminologies on toric geometry are based on [1].

Example 1. *Let X be $\mathbb{A}^3_{\mathbb{C}}$ and Z be defined by the ideal $\mathfrak{a} = (x_1^d x_2, x_2^d x_3, x_3^d x_1)$. Then, $|Z|$ is the union of x_i-axes ($i = 1,2,3$). As a toric variety, X is defined by a cone $\sigma := \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{e}_i$ in $N_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}^3$, where $\mathbf{e}_1 = (1,0,0), \mathbf{e}_2 = (0,1,0), \mathbf{e}_3 = (0,0,1)$.*

The Z-Nash divisors are $D_{\mathbf{p}_i}$ ($i = 1,2,3$) which correspond to $\mathbf{p}_1 = (0,1,1), \mathbf{p}_2 = (1,0,1), \mathbf{p}_3 = (1,1,0)$. When $d = 2$, we can see that $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) = 0$*, while $a(D_{\mathbf{p}_i};X,Z) = 1$ for $i = 1,2,3$. When $d = 3$, we can see that* $\operatorname{mld}(X,Z) = -\infty$*, while $a(D_{\mathbf{p}_i};X,Z) = 1$ for $i = 1,2,3$.*

In order to produce divisors which compute the minimal log-discrepancy, we need to modify X into a more reasonable space. We will see that for a toric pair (X,Z), the normalized blow up of X by the defining ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of Z is an appropriate space.

Definition 2.6. *Let (X,Z) be a toric pair and let $\varphi : \overline{X} \longrightarrow X$ be the normalized blow up by the defining ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of Z. Let $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ be a log-resolution and $E_i (i = 1, \ldots, r)$ be the irreducible exceptional* *divisors of f, then f factors as $f = \varphi \circ g$ for $g : Y \longrightarrow \overline{X}$. We say that E_i is a log-Nash divisor for (X, Z) if the closure of $g_\infty\Big((\pi^Y)^{-1}(E_i)\Big)$ is an irreducible component of $(\pi^{\overline{X}})^{-1}(\varphi^{-1}(Z))$ and call this component a log-Nash component. Note that among all divisors over X there is a unique log-Nash divisor up to birational equivalence for a fixed log-Nash component.*

Theorem 2.7. *Let (X, Z) be a toric pair, then the following hold:*

1. *The set of log-Nash divisors for (X, Z) coincides with the set of log-essential divisors.*
2. *If X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein and (X, Z) is log-canonical, then a log-Nash divisor computes the minimal log-discrepancy.*
3. *If X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein and (X, Z) is not log-canonical, then there is a log-Nash divisor with a negative log-discrepancy.*

Proof. First of all, note that the normalized blow up $\varphi : \overline{X} \longrightarrow X$ is a toric morphism. Actually it corresponds to the decomposition into the dual fan of the Newton polygon $\Gamma_+(\mathfrak{a})$ for the ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of Z. In the same way as in [3, Theorem 2.15], we have the first inclusion of the following, while the second one is trivial:

{log-Nash divisors for (X, Z)}$\subset$ {log-essential divisors for (X, Z)}.
$\subset$ {divisors appearing in every toric log-resolution of (X, Z)}.

For the statement (i), it is sufficient to show the equality of the first and the third sets. In fact, the first set is the same as {$\varphi^{-1}(Z)$-Nash divisors} and it coincides with {$\varphi^{-1}(Z)$-essential divisors} by Petrov's result Theorem2.4. His proof also shows that this set is the same as {divisors appearing in every toric $\varphi^{-1}(Z)$-resolution}. As a toric log-resolution always factor through $\overline{X}$ and an invariant divisor on a non-singular toric variety is always normal crossings, therefore a toric $\varphi^{-1}(Z)$-resolution of $\overline{X}$ is the same as a toric log-resolution of (X, Z). Thus, it follows the required coincidence of the sets.

In order to prove (ii) and (iii), we remark that for a prime divisor E and an effective divisor D on a non-singular variety Y and the generic point γ of $(\pi^Y)^{-1}(E)$,

$$\mathrm{ord}_E(D) = \mathrm{ord}_\gamma(\mathcal{O}_Y(-D)).$$

Let r be the index of K_X. Let $\mathcal{L} = \varphi^*\omega_X^{[r]} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}(r\varphi^{-1}(Z))$, then it is an invertible sheaf on $\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$. If (X, Z) is log-canonical, then $\mathcal{L}$ is moreover an ideal sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$. Indeed, on a toric log-resolution $f : Y \longrightarrow X$, we have

$$a(E;X,Z) = \frac{1}{r}\left(\mathrm{ord}_E(rK_{Y/X}) - r\,\mathrm{ord}_E\, f^{-1}(Z) + r\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{r}\,\mathrm{ord}_E(-f^*(rK_X) - rf^{-1}(Z)) \geq 0 \qquad (1)$$

for every ivariant prime divisor E on Y. Here we used that

$$K_Y = -\sum_{D\text{:}invariant\ prime\ divisor} D.$$

Therefore, $-f^*(rK_X) - rf^{-1}(Z)$ is an effective Cartier divisor on Y, which yields that $\mathcal{L} = g_*g^*(\mathcal{L}) = g_*\left(\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*(rK_X) + rf^{-1}(Z))\right) \subset \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$, where $g : Y \longrightarrow \overline{X}$ is the factorization of f by $\varphi : \overline{X} \longrightarrow X$. Now, we see by (1),

$$a(E;X,Z) = \frac{1}{r}\,\mathrm{ord}_\gamma(g^*\mathcal{L}) = \frac{1}{r}\,\mathrm{ord}_{g_\infty(\gamma)}(\mathcal{L}),$$

where γ is the generic point of $(\pi^Y)^{-1}(E)$. If E computes the minimal log-discrepancy, take the log-Nash divisor E_0 with the generic point $\alpha \in (\pi^Y)^{-1}(E_0)$ such that $g_\infty(\gamma) \in \overline{g_\infty(\alpha)}$. Then, by the upper semi-continuity of the order in the arc space,

$$\mathrm{mld}(X,Z) = \mathrm{ord}_{g_\infty(\gamma)}(\mathcal{L}) \geq \mathrm{ord}_{g_\infty(\alpha)}(\mathcal{L}) = a(E_0;X,Z),$$

which shows that E_0 computes the minimal log-discrepancy as required in (ii).

If (X,Z) is not log-canonical, then $\mathcal{L} \not\subset \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$. Indeed, if $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$, for every prime divisor E over X with the generic point $\gamma \in (\pi^Y)^{-1}(E)$, we have $a(E;X,Z) = \frac{1}{r}\,\mathrm{ord}_\gamma\,\mathcal{O}_Y(g^*\mathcal{L}) \geq 0$, which implies that (X,Z) is log-canonical, a contradiction. Now, we can put $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}(D - D')$, where $D > 0$ and $D' \geq 0$ are invariant divisors which do not have common components. Then, for a prime divisor $E \leq D$

$$a(E;X,Z) = \frac{1}{r}\,\mathrm{ord}_E(-D + D') < 0.$$

As E is a prime divisor on $\overline{X}$ with the support in $|\varphi^{-1}(Z)|$, it is a log-Nash divisor. □

Remark 1. *One can prove (ii) and (iii) also by the combinatorics on the fan.*

Another way to prove (ii) is to observe that every divisor that computes the minimal log-discrepancy is an log-essential divisor and then use (i). This way provides us with the stronger fact that all divisors that compute the minimal log discrepancy are log-Nash divisors. But I presented a proof above which does not use (i), because this proof may *be useful to study a general case in which the Nash problem does not hold.*

References

[1] W. Fulton, *Introduction to Toric Varieties*, Annals of Math. Studies **131**, Princeton Univ. Press. (1993).

[2] P.D. González Péres, *Bijectiveness of the Nash map for quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularities.* Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2007) no. 19, Art. ID rnm076, 13 pp.

[3] S. Ishii and J. Kollár, *The Nash problem on arc families of singularities,* Duke Math. J. **120** No.3 (2003) 601-620.

[4] S. Ishii, *Arcs, valuations and the Nash map*, J. reine angew. Math, **588** (2005) 71–92.

[5] S. Ishii, *The local Nash problem on arc families of singularities*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble **56** (2006) 1207–1224.

[6] S. Ishii, *Jet schemes, arc spaces and the Nash map*, C.R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada **29** (1) (2007) 1–21.

[7] M. Lejeune-Jalabert and A. J. Reguera-Lopez, *Arcs and wedges on sandwiched surface singularities*, Amer. J. Math. **121**, (1999) 1191–1213.

[8] M. Lejeune-Jalabert and A. J. Reguera-Lopez, *Exceptional divisors which are not uniruled belong to the image of the Nash map.* preprint, (2008) arXiv:0811.2421.

[9] J. F. Nash, *Arc structure of singularities*, Duke Math. J. **81**, (1995) 31–38.

[10] P. Petrov, *Nash problem for stable toric varieties*, Math. Nachr. **282** (2009) 1575–1583.

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Oh-Okayama, Meguro, Tokyo, Japan, shihoko@math.titech.ac.jp